

## Scianni, Melissa

---

**From:** Wachter, Eric  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 25, 2015 7:02 AM  
**To:** Zito, Kelly  
**Subject:** RE: Please preserve the Clean Water Act

No, they are all the same. In the past we've never had the ability to respond to them. However, now we can extract the email addresses, paste them in the web app and respond if we feel like we have a good story to tell and want to tell it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Zito, Kelly  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 6:43 PM  
To: Wachter, Eric  
Subject: RE: Please preserve the Clean Water Act

Hi Eric - Another follow up. Can you tell me if these are form letters?  
When you say the Administrator has received more than 3,600 letters on this topic, are they all unique?  
Thanks-  
Kelly

-----Original Message-----

From: Wachter, Eric  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2015 1:59 PM  
To: Zito, Kelly  
Subject: FW: Please preserve the Clean Water Act

Hi, Kelly,  
I heard at senior staff on Monday Jared's report about the action on the salt ponds. The below email is one of more than 3,600 the Administrator received on this topic. We in OEX have the ability to extract the email addresses and send a reply from the Administrator in response to these emails.

Would you suggest that we respond to these messages? If so, would you prefer that the Administrator or Jared?

Once I hear back from you, I'll check with the press and outreach offices here but wanted to get your perspective first.  
Thanks.

Eric E. Wachter  
Director, Office of the Executive Secretariat U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
(202) 564-7960 office  
(202) 596-0246 cell

-----Original Message-----

From: Selena [mailto:s[REDACTED]@epa.gov] b6  
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2015 6:10 PM  
To: McCarthy, Gina  
Subject: Please preserve the Clean Water Act

Dear Administrator McCarthy:

San Francisco Bay's waters are under attack, and we need your urgent leadership to preserve federal protection for them.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is poised to relinquish federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction on San Francisco Bay salt ponds at the request of Cargill, the largest private corporation in the United States. Cargill's heavy lobbying of Corps lawyers resulted in an internal legal memo that would reverse decades of federal protection for Bay salt ponds, and upend long-established precedents. That novel, unilateral re-interpretation of the Clean Water Act was created in secret, without EPA consultation, Congressional approval, or opportunity for public input. It's outrageous!

Cargill has brazenly declared it wants to win exemption from the Clean Water Act and other legal protections for salt ponds in Redwood City, California, so it can pave over wetlands to build thousands of homes in the Bay there. But the EPA can still preserve legal protection for the Bay's salt ponds.

We urge you to use your authority to prevent the U.S. Army Corps from declining Clean Water Act jurisdiction on Bay salt ponds, and ensure that EPA retains the lead responsibility for evaluating federal protection of these important waters of the United States.

Thank you for taking action,

Selena Baker